

20  
AN AFFECTIONATE  
ADDRESS

To the PEOPLE called  
QUAKERS;

With Regard to <sup>4152.aa.59</sup>  
<sub>1-6.</sub>

WATER-BAPTISM,  
AND THE  
LORD'S SUPPER.

Wherein the  
Arguments of the late Learned Mr ROBERT  
BARCLAY, are considered.

---

BY  
VINCENT PERRONET, A.M.  
Vicar of *Shoreham* in *Kent*; and Chaplain to the *R*  
Right Honourable EARL STANHOPE.

---

St JOHN xv. 14.  
Ye are my Friends, if ye do WHATSOEVER I  
command You.

---

L O N D O N:  
Printed for B. Dod, at the *Bible* and *Key* in *Ave-*  
*Mary Lane*, near Stationers-Hall.

---

MDCCLVII.

AN AFFECTUOUS  
ADDRESS  
TO THE PEOPLE CALLED  
QUAKERS:

With regard to  
WATER-BAPTISM  
AND THE  
LORD'S SUPPER.



Arguments of the late Mr. Robert  
BARCLAY, M.P.

BY  
VINCENT PERROWE, A.M.  
Vicar of St. Andrew in Kent, and Chaplain to the  
Right Honourable EARL ST. VINCENT.

Ye are my Friends, if ye do what I command You.

LONDON:  
Printed for H. DODD, at the Bible and Key in the  
Mug Lane, near St. Dunstons-Hall.



TO THE  
PEOPLE  
CALLED  
QUAKERS.

*My dear Brethren,*



VERY sincerely wish all of you  
every *spiritual Blessing in Christ  
Jesus.*

As I think you to be mis-  
taken in some Points of Doctrine; you will, I  
hope, excuse this ADDRESS, which is far  
from designing you the least Injury.

THE former Part of it was wrote some time  
since, to one of your own People, (an acute



and ingenious Man) in return to a private Letter, I had received from him ; and in answer to several Objections, in a printed Letter \* of his to another Person.

As that printed Letter contains many of Mr *Barclay's* Arguments against *Water-Baptism*, consequently an Answer to that Letter, so far as it proposes Mr *Barclay's* Arguments, must be esteemed an Answer to that learned Gentleman himself.

As to such of Mr *Barclay's* Objections, as are not mentioned in that printed Letter, I have afterwards considered them apart by themselves ; as I likewise have the Sum and Substance of his Arguments relating to the *Lord's Supper* : nor do I know that I have omitted any material Objection of that learned Writer.

You will, I durst say, readily acknowledge, that an indispensable Obligation lies on every Professor of *Christianity*, to obey *all* the Precepts of *Christ* ; even though *such* Precepts should

\* It is entitled a second Letter to the Reverend Mr *Bate*, &c. by T — S —, Esq;



called QUAKERS. v

should seem, like the *Doctrine of Christ crucified*, — unto the Jews, a *stumbling Block*; and unto the Greeks, *Foolishness*. 1 Cor. i. 23.

AND therefore, if it should appear, that what are usually called the *two Sacraments*, are really *such Institutions of Christ*, as are *binding to all Christians*, in *all Ages* of his Church upon Earth; you must then own your Obligation of complying *even with these*. And if the Arguments of such a Writer as Mr *Barclay*, can be shewn to be *inconclusive*; this, I think, must be a strong Presumption, that those Sacraments are of *perpetual Obligation*.

HOWEVER, my Brethren, if I can convince you of nothing else; I trust, at least, to convince you of *one Thing*, and that is, that I desire only to treat you in the *Spirit of Love and Meekness*.

YOU will find, in my Letter, something said both of *Original Sin*, and of the *Inspiration* of the *sacred Writings*: but though the whole Piece be addressed to *all* of You, it is

vi      *To the PEOPLE, &c.*

not my Design to make *any* of you Parties in  
*any one* Particular, which you approve not of.

MAY God's holy Spirit so influence our  
Hearts and Minds, that we may always *prove*  
*what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect*  
*Will of God.* Rom. xii. 2.

*Your sincere Well-wisher,*

VIN. PERRONET.

A N



AN AFFECTIONATE  
ADDRESS

To the People called  
QUAKERS.



SHALL here first trouble you  
with my Letter before mentioned,  
in the same Form and Words in  
which it was wrote; excepting  
only the Omission of the Person's  
Name, and the Addition of a few  
Notes in the Margin, with two or three Texts of  
*Scripture.*



*Shoreham, Sept. 8, 1746.*

Mr —

**I**F any Divines of the Church of *England* set light by the *Inspiration of the holy Spirit*, they either know little of the *Doctrine* of their own *Church*; or else they set but *little* by it.

AND as to others, of any Denomination, who pretend *so far* to a *present Inspiration*, as to be able to *correct* the *Doctrines* of the *Apostles*, they are *very far* either from establishing the Authority of the *Spirit*, or of *Him* from whom that *Spirit* proceeds\*.

HAD I before seen your second Letter to the Reverend Mr *Bate*, I had hardly given myself the Trouble of collecting together so many Passages out of the *sacred Writings*, as I have done in my former.

FOR notwithstanding your *extraordinary Concession*, that “*the Apostles were, in what they said*” “*and did, generally Right; more especially the*” “*latter End of their Time, when the Prejudice of*” “*Education was more fully subdued by the Power*” “*of the Spirit.*” [P. 38.] Yet few Persons with such Notions need ever be much afraid of *Scripture-Authority*: since whatever clashes or interferes with our own Opinions or private Suggestions; if

\* It may be highly proper to observe here, that the learned Mr *Barclay* maintains no such Doctrine: he affirms that *divine inward Revelations neither do nor can ever contradict the outward Testimony of the Scriptures.* *Apology Eng. Second Proposition.*

*the People called* QUAKERS. 9

if we should only fancy it to be either some old *Jewish Rite*, or something *Cousin-german* to it, [P. 39.] the whole *Apostolic Authority* is set aside.

HOWEVER, as you further desire my Sentiments, I here send them very much at large; that I may not appear to have overlooked your Arguments.

IF the *Scriptures* are the Dictates of the *holy Ghost*, as I contend\*; — They are then, when rightly understood, the *sole Rule* of all *religious Faith*.

BUT if they are not the Dictates of the *holy Ghost*; we may as well quote *Seneca* as *St Paul*.

THE *Apostles* were, at least, *infallibly* led by the *Spirit*, with respect to *all those Doctrines*, which were to be taught Christians: though they were themselves gradually to be drawn from their own Prejudices†.

THEY had undoubtedly their Failings and Infirmities; and which are recorded to teach us *Watchfulness* and *Humility*; not to furnish out Matter for *Triumph*, *Ridicule*, or *Abuse* [P. 35-39.]

I SHOULD be glad to know, where we read, that *the rest of the Apostles rebuked Peter, for preaching the Gospel to Cornelius*? Or in what  
History

\* Mr *Barclay* sufficiently maintains the same; though, I think, that learned Writer is guilty of some small Inaccuracy, in styling the *holy Spirit* the *Rule*: whereas his *Word* or *Doctrine* is the *Rule*; and *He himself* the *Ruler*. See his third Proposition.

† St John x i. 12—15.

*History* we may find, that *Circumcision* was by the *Apostles* themselves deemed an indispensable Condition of Acceptance with God? And yet you venture to affirm both these, [P. 35.] without citing your Authority for either.

IT appears indeed from [*Acts* xi. 2, 3.] that they that were of the *Circumcision*; that is, that certain Jewish Converts, found Fault with St Peter for going to Cornelius; but the divine Writer says not one Word that any *Apostle* did so. The *Apostles* are forceably brought in from the preceding Verse; where they are mentioned upon quite another Occasion. And as to your next Charge relating to *Circumcision*, that is still much worse: For it is expressly declared by St Luke to be the Sentiment of certain of the Pharisees; but to be altogether disowned, and severely condemned by the whole Body of the *Apostles* \*. So that here is a very heavy Charge against the *Apostles*; in opposition to the clearest Evidence!

BUT now, as he must be a very careless Reader of the *New Testament*, who cannot discern between human Infirmities and the Doctrines of Christ: so you will give me Leave to think, that such a Person's Prejudices of Education are in no measure subdued, who can get Leave of himself to imagine, that *Water-Baptism* is but a mere Jewish Ceremony. [P. 36, 38.]

THE

\* *Acts* xv. 1, 5, 8—11, 24.



*the People called* QUAKERS. 11

THE Difficulties you start [P. 33, 34.] with regard to the Case of *Cornelius* and his Friends, I think, will admit of a very easy Solution. Tho' God has confined Us to positive Rules, yet He has not confined Himself. His usual Method was to bestow the extraordinary Gifts of the holy Spirit *after* Baptism\*; but here He saw proper that these Gifts should come *before*. And I presume for this Reason, amongst others, that the most *gifted* Persons should not think themselves *above* his Ordinances. Especially, when *Christ* himself, at the Entrance of his divine Ministry, condescended to submit to it. This was previous to the Descent of the *holy Ghost*; by which he was initiated into his *prophetic* Office†.

HOWEVER, to break the Force of this Argument drawn from our Lord's *Baptism*, you say, "It is difficult to tell, whether *St John's Ministry* and *Baptism* belonged to the Law, or the Gospel; was Legal or Evangelical?" Moreover you observe, that "our Saviour was likewise circumcised." And further, you fling in the following Difficulties; "These Men, you say, would do well to distinguish between what our Saviour did as a Jew, and what he preached as a Christian." And then you demand, "At what Time, think you, did the Christian Religion begin, whether before

\* Acts ii. 38. Chap. viii. 10—17. Chap. xix. 5, 6.

† St Matth. iii. 16, 17. St Mark i. 9—11, 14, 15.

*“ before or after our Saviour’s Crucifixion? ”*  
[P. 29, 30.]

I MUST observe, that there is nothing, which a lively Imagination cannot raise *Difficulties* about. Otherwise, nothing is plainer, than that St *John’s Ministry* and *Baptism* were altogether preparatory to the *Gospel-Dispensation*.

As to the *Distinction* you would have made; if you consider, that though the *Jews* baptized all their *Profelytes* both young and old; yet they did not baptize any *Adult Jews*; and that this was the Reason of their Question to St *John*, — *Why baptizest thou then* \* ?

I SAY, if you consider these Things, you can hardly suppose, that our Lord’s *Baptism* was any *Legal* or *Mosaical* Rite. And as to your *Query*, I can scarce imagine, that you can make any serious Doubt, *when the Christian Religion commenced*? For can any one *imagine*, who has only read with Attention the four Gospels, that from our Lord’s *Baptism* to his *Crucifixion*, he only employed his public Ministry in preaching the *Law of Moses* † ?

BUT

\* St John i. 25. Though it has been disputed amongst the Learned, whether the *Jews* baptized their own *Infants*; yet none has supposed, that they baptized any *adult Jews*. Tho’ it is plain from that Text, that they thought the *Messiah*, *Elias*, or *that Prophet* might, and would do it. See the learned *Grotius* and *Lightfoot* on the Place.

† Let only these two Verses be attended to. St Mark i. 14, 15.

the People called QUAKERS. 13

BUT now, if *He* who was the great *Author and Finisher of our Faith*, has given *Water-Baptism* the Authority, not *only* of his own Example, but of his *express Command* §; it will be but a poor Compliment we make Him, to suppose his Precepts *inconsistent* with his *spiritual Religion*. [P. 33, 42.]

HOWEVER, from our Lord's Words to the *Baptist*, — *suffer it to be so now*, [St Matth. iii. 15.] you conclude the *short Duration of this Baptism to be strongly denoted*. [P. 30.] Whereas, tho' these Words do very evidently *denote*, that *Christ* would no more be *baptized with Water*; yet there is not the *least* Intimation, that “ his Disciples “ *should never have a Commission to baptize with “ Water in his Name.*”

As to your farther Confirmation, [P. 31.] from these Words of St *John*, “ — *He must increase, “ but I must decrease* ;” [St John iii. 30.] I should take these Words to make very strongly against you. For in what is *Christ* to *increase*, if not in the establishing and enlarging his Kingdom in the World? And how is his Kingdom to be *established and enlarged*, but by his Doctrines and Commands taking place in the Hearts and Practice of Mankind?

AND

§ It must be acknowledged, that our Lord having been *baptized*, is not of *itself* sufficient to evince that *Water-Baptism* is a standing Ordinance in his Church. But if it appears to be likewise his *Command*; this will make a wide Difference between this *Rite* and *Circumcision*.



AND if it should be made appear, that *Water-Baptism* is part of those Doctrines and Commands, it will follow, that this *Institution* of *Christ's* must continue; though *John's Baptism* would entirely cease.

FOR any Person to object, that they were both only *Water-Baptism*, would be to trifle; since they appear to differ in every Circumstance. *John's Baptism* was to engage Men to believe in *Christ*, and likewise to repent\*: *Christ's Baptism* previously required both *Faith* and *Repentance*, in all who were capable of them†.

MOREOVER, this was to be administered in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost§: whereas, it is evident, that the other was not||.

AND further, the *Baptism* commanded by *Christ*, was in order to receive the *Baptism* of the holy Ghost‡: which was not the Case of *St John's Baptism\*\**.

BUT again, you observe, that the *Baptist* speaks of his own *Baptism*, in the present Tense, — I indeed baptize you; but of our Saviour's in the future,

\* St Matth. iii. 11. Acts xix. 4. † Acts ii. 38.

chap. viii. 36—38. § St Matth. xxviii. 19.

|| Acts xix. 2—5. How could it be supposed, that any should be baptized in the Name of *Christ*, before He had so much as began his public Ministry? Or in the Name of the holy Ghost before the holy Ghost was given?

‡ Acts ii. 38. chap. viii. 14—17. \*\* Chap. xix. 2—6.

*the People called* **QUAKERS.** 15

*ture, — but he shall baptize you. [P. 31.] St Matth.*

*iii. 11. But does St John declare by this, that Christ would never direct his Apostles to baptize with Water? Or does not our holy Lord himself declare to Nicodemus, that except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God? St John iii. 5.*

*HOWEVER, you seem to apprehend great Assistance from these Words of St Paul, — There is one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism. Eph. iv. 5. From hence you collect, that spiritual Baptism is here intended, and the other absolutely denied. [P. 31.]*

*Now, if you will but reflect, that Baptism was a public Profession of Faith in Christ; and that a Belief in Him was previously necessary to Baptism in all adult Persons; [St Matth. xxviii. 19. Acts viii. 37. chap. xvi. 31—33. chap. xxii. 16.] I say, if you consider this, you will find those Words have this easy and natural Meaning: “As  
“there is one Lord, and one Faith; so there is  
“one and the same Way of solemnly professing  
“our Faith in that one Lord, which is done at  
“our Baptism; when we are baptized in the  
“Name, and into the Faith of our Lord Jesus  
“Christ.” So that it is only, as if the Apostle had said, “There is one Lord, one Faith, and one  
“Baptism into the Faith of that one Lord.”*

**CONSE-**

CONSEQUENTLY the Words are so far from excluding *Water-Baptism*, that they plainly point at it \*.

IN Page 32 you observe, that the Commission to baptize, *St Matth. xxviii. 19. makes no mention of Water*: nor do I know of any Person who affirms the contrary; excepting perhaps *yourself*: for thus you seem plainly to speak, no less than three times, [P. 33, 41.]

HOWEVER, to make Amends for this Mistake, you would understand that *Term* in a more sublime Signification, than *elementary Water*, *ibid.*

AND this Opinion you would confirm, [P. 41.] from the Words of our Lord, as recorded by *St Mark*: *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned.* Chap. xvi. 16.

WHEREAS, here is nothing more, than what frequently occurs in the New Testament; that *Men were to be initiated into the Church of Christ by Faith and Baptism*: Where they certainly are in the *Way* of Salvation, if they will but persevere and pay a steady and universal Obedience to the whole Gospel of Christ.

HOWEVER, if this Text be not sufficient, you are for calling in to your Assistance, the entire Epistle of *St Paul* to the *Hebrews*; and you would infer from the *Abolishing of legal Sacrifices and Wash-*

\* Some further Notice will be taken of this Objection, in answer to Mr *Barelay*.



*Washings*, that infinite Wisdom could not institute, as Gospel Ordinances, other Rites and Ceremonies equally carnal and incapable to purify the Conscience. [P. 43.]

THE whole of this Argument amounts to thus much, "Infinite Wisdom has abolished legal *Washings*; therefore infinite Wisdom cannot institute *Water-Baptism*, under the Gospel!" *Water*, undoubtedly, is the same Element in both Institutions; but if the Wisdom of God should see proper to set aside the Use of it, in one Case; and to direct the Use of it in another; what is here inconsistent with *divine Wisdom*?

BESIDES, St Paul, who was himself baptized, [Acts ix. 18.] and had baptized others, [1 Cor. i. 14—16.] does in this very Epistle, thus exhort the Hebrews, *Let us draw near with a true Heart, in full Assurance of Faith, having our Hearts sprinkled from an evil Conscience, and our Bodies washed with pure Water.* Chap. x. 22.

THIS last Clause seems evidently meant of *Water-Baptism*; and is so understood by Commentators of the first Name, both Ancient and Modern\*.

BUT let us still proceed to some other Objections. And suppose then, according to your Opinion, that the Disciples baptized at first *without a Commission* from our holy Lord. [P. 32.] which

B

however

\* Chrysostom, Theophylact, Menochius, Gomarus, Whitby.

however is very groundless; does it follow, that they were *not* to baptize, when they *had* a Commission?

OR, because Christ himself *did not baptize*; or suppose the *Seventy* did not; [P. 32.] or, because *St Paul was not sent to baptize*; or did not direct *Timothy* to baptize; [P. 40, 41.] will it therefore follow, that Christ *gave no Commission to baptize with Water*? You will not certainly abide by such an Inference.

HOWEVER, you would willingly affix a figurative Meaning upon the Word *baptize* in that Commission; [P. 32.] though there be not the least Necessity for so doing; except the *Necessity* of the *Cause* you are maintaining.

BUT now admitting, that it was really doubtful from the Sentence itself, whether the Word *baptize* ought to be taken in a *figurative* Sense or not; yet surely an *unprejudiced* Person would think, that when those, commissioned by our holy Lord, had by their uniform Practice so clearly shewn his Design, there would be no longer any room for Doubt or Dispute.

FOR instance, when at *St Peter's* first Sermon, such Numbers cried out, — *what shall we do?* the Apostle, *filled with the holy Ghost*, thus answered, — *Repent, and be Baptized.* Acts ii. 4, 37, 38.

AGAIN, when *Philip*, by command of the Spirit, *joined himself to the Chariot of the Ethiopian*,  
and

*the People called* QUAKERS. 19

and afterwards instructed and *baptized* him. Chap. viii. 29—39. And when *Ananias* was sent by the Lord *Jesus* to *Saul*, he commanded him to *arise*, and be *baptized*, and to *wash away his Sins*. Chap. ix. 10—18. Chap. xxii. 16.

AGAIN, when those Disciples, who had already received *John's Baptism*, were afterwards *baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, in order to receive the holy Ghost by the Imposition of *St Paul's Hands*. Chap. xix. 1—6. And as to that Apostle himself; whom you mention, [P. 40, 41.] it is owned he *was not sent to baptize*; for indeed his Office was of a much more arduous Nature; and required much more Labour and divine Wisdom, than the Office of Baptizing; which those of much less Importance, could have executed as well as himself.

HOWEVER, when that Apostle, who *had the Care of all the Churches daily upon his Hands*; [2 Cor. xi. 28.] did yet *Baptize* some; 1 Cor. i. 14—17. But especially when *St Peter*, who was sent immediately by the holy Spirit to *Cornelius*, and who had himself been directed by an *Angel of God* to send to that Apostle. *Acts* x. 3—5, 19, 20. I say, when this inspired Apostle *baptized Cornelius* and his Company, even *after* the Descent of the *holy Ghost* upon them; any *indifferent* Person would surely apprehend, that here was so full and evident an Explanation of what our blessed



Lord designed in his Commission, that no Place was left for doubting or disputing.

BUT alas! there is nothing so plain and manifest, which may *not* be disputed, where Men of Zeal and Ingenuity are concerned. For instead of submitting to so decisive a Determination of the Point in dispute; the great Apostle stands corrected for *unseasonably commanding Water-Baptism; when the End for which we practise it, was previously and effectually answered: [P. 36.]* And the Whole is resolved into an *inordinate Love of Jewish Ceremony! [P. 38.]*

PRAY attend seriously and calmly for one Moment:

WHEN our blessed Lord had promised, that *the Spirit of Truth should teach his Apostles all Things; and should guide them into all Truth; [St John xiv. 26. Chap. xvi. 13.]* notwithstanding this Promise of Him, who is the *Way*, the *Truth*, and the *Life*, to find one of these Apostles when sent by an *immediate and express* Command of that very *Spirit of Truth*, *blundering* in the very midst of a Message, of the last Importance; relating to no less an Affair, than the *eternal Salvation* of several Persons; [*Acts xi. 12—14.*] I say, such a Treatment and Representation of an inspired Apostle of Christ; (to say nothing more of the Treatment of all the Rest) how agreeable soever these things may prove to the Infidel Part  
of

of the World; they must give every *unprejudiced* and *serious* Christian very high Concern.

WHAT must *Unbelievers* think of Christ's Promise; when upon so *important* an Occasion, the *holy Spirit* neither *taught* nor *guided* the Apostle?

BUT now, if you can think more soberly of *Water-Baptism*, it may be proper to proceed to another Part of your Enquiry, relating to the *Effects* or *Benefits* of it.

And first, though we were not able so much as to guess, what any of its *Benefits* are, in particular; it might yet be sufficient to answer, *Do as thou art directed; and never dispute the Commands of Christ*. However, let it be observed, that St Paul, speaking of God our Saviour, thus expresses himself; "*According to his Mercy he saved us, by the Washing of Regeneration, and Renewing of the holy Ghost.*" Tit. iii. 5. This is evidently the being *born of Water and of the Spirit*, mentioned by our holy Lord to Nicodemus, as necessary to the *entring into the Kingdom of God*. St John iii. 5.

AGAIN, the Apostle St Peter speaking of the Ark, wherein Noah and his Family were saved by Water, thus compares *Baptism* with it; "*The like Figure whereunto*, says the Apostle, *even Baptism, doth also now save us (not the putting away the Filth of the Flesh, but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God) by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.*" 1 Epist. iii. 20, 21.

That is, by Virtue of what Christ has *done* for us, we are put into a *saveable* State by *Baptism*; provided the Heart and Mind are right before God\*.

FROM comparing of all which together, we may reasonably conclude, that where there is no Impediment in the *Subject*, there the *holy Spirit* will accompany the *outward Ordinance*, and become an *inward Principle* of renewing our Natures. Thus we are made Members of *Christ's mystical Body* †, by an Institution of his own Appointment; we are thus in Covenant with him; and in a Way to gain that *eternal Life*, which he has purchased for us ||.

NOT but it is in our own Power to defeat all this, and to drive the *holy Spirit* from us §. Our very *Baptism* lays an indispensable Obligation upon us to *walk in Newness of Life* ‡.

WE grant, that if *any Man*, though baptized, *have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his* \*\*.

IT is evidently required of all, that *through the Spirit, they mortify the Deeds of the Body* ††; that they *walk in the Spirit* |||; and *bring forth the Fruits of it*: for *they, that are Christ's have crucified the Flesh, with the Affections and Lusts* §§. And *they [only] are the Sons of God, who are led by the*

\* Some further Notice will be taken of this Passage in answer to Mr Barclay.

† Ephes. i. 22, 23. chap.

v. 26, 27, 30.

|| 1 John v. 11, 12.

§ John

xv. 6, 9, 10. Col. i. 21—23. Heb. xii. 15. Ephes. iv. 30.

‡ Rom. vi. 3—13.

\*\* Chap. viii. 9.

†† Chap.

viii. 13.

||| Ver. 1.

Gal. v. 25,

§§ Ver. 22—24.



*the Spirit of God* \*. So that every Man that hath this Hope in him, must purify himself, even as He is pure †. For if any Man be in Christ, he is a new Creature ||.

WITHOUT sincerely labouring after these Things, *Baptism* will give us no *indefeasible* Title to *eternal Life*. But it is not therefore *less* the Command of Christ; nor *less* the Duty of Christians.

As to the *little Room* to boast of the *Efficacy* of this Ordinance, which you likewise object, [P. 44.] This is no more an Argument against its being a Precept of Christ, than the bad Lives of Christians is an Argument against the *divine Authority* of Christianity.

It was a Saying of a very learned and pious Person, that if he was to chuse a Religion by the Lives of its Professors, Christianity would be the last Religion he should chuse.

THOUGH I think this worthy Prelate (for such he was) has expressed himself too strongly; yet nothing is more fallacious than to infer the Falsity of a Religion from the Lives of those who profess it. In like Manner, *Baptism* is not to be estimated by the Lives of those who are *unworthy* of it, and a *Dis honour* to it.

BUT now, with Regard to the Effects of *Original Sin*; since we are assured, that as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive §. That

B 4

as

\* Rom. viii. 14.  
v. 17. Gal. vi. 15.

† 1 John. iii. 3.  
§ 1 Cor. xv. 22.

|| 2 Cor.

*as Sin hath reigned unto Death; even so might Grace reign, through Righteousness, unto eternal Life, by Jesus Christ our Lord; and that through Him, the Gift of God is eternal Life\*.*

As we are assured of this, and more to the same Purpose; as appears in other Parts of the *divine Writings* †; I am therefore entirely of Opinion, that Mankind are all in a *fallen State*; from whence, Christ came on Purpose to rescue us; and to restore the *lost Image* of God in our Souls. But let the Loss or Damage be what it will; since it is thus amply repaired by our blessed Lord, here is nothing that impeaches the moral Character of God. For *where Sin abounded, there Grace did much more abound*, Rom. v. 20.

BUT still, I must not conclude this long Letter, before I have taken Notice of another Argument of yours, different from all the rest, against *Water Baptism*.

IT is quite in the *scholastic* Way; and, I must own, very *specious*. But it really proves no more, than a *thorough Inclination* to defend a *weak Cause*.

FOR to attempt to reason against the *clearest Scripture-Evidence*, for this Institution, by *Arguments drawn* (as you suppose) *from the Nature and*  
*Essence*

\* Rom. v. 21. chap. vi. 23. † Psal. li. 5. Rom. v. 6—20. Chap. vii. 14—25. Ephes. ii. 3. Compare Gen. ii. 17. with those Passages, and likewise with the following, Rom. iii. 23. Ephes. iv. 24. Coloss. iii. 9, 10,

*the People called* QUAKERS. 25

*Essence of the Gospel Religion; and from the general Scope, Design, and Tendency of Things, [P. 42.] I say, though these Words sound well, and may influence inattentive Minds; yet such a Proceeding is only opposing our own Thoughts, to the plain Discoveries of the Will of God in divine Revelation.*

WE cannot see into the *Reason* of God's Command; and therefore reject it. From hence it was, that the *preaching of Christ crucified*, proved to the *Jews a stumbling Block, and to the Greeks Foolishness*, 1 Cor. i. 23. and this has been one great Source of the spreading *Deism* and *Infidelity* of the present Age.

THE *Wisdom of God*, will always appear but *Weakness* to every proud and haughty Mind: And it is but just, that such should be given up to judicial Blindness.

THE Want of an humble Acquiescence in the divine Will, when it was sufficiently discovered, had like to have proved very fatal to a very great Man.—*Are not Abana and Pharpar, Rivers of Damascus, better than all the Waters of Israel? May I not wash in them and be clean?* 2 Kings v. 12. Naaman thought, no doubt, that he argued strongly from the *Nature and Essence of Things*. But, like all other *Reasoners* in *Opposition* to the *plain Will* of God, he left God out of the Account; and had therefore



therefore like to have continued, as he righteously deserved, a *Leper* all the Days of his Life.

HE considered not, that the despised *Waters of Israel* must have answered every Purpose which God designed; though he himself could not perceive the *Mode* or *Manner* of it, nor assign a satisfactory Reason to his own Thoughts, *why* any particular divine Efficacy should attend the Stream of *Jordan*. He was indeed happily recovered from his *Phrenzy*; and I pray God, that all in the like Circumstances, may have their Eyes opened, and their Hearts duly influenced.

I WOULD not however be misunderstood, as if I condemned Arguments which were *really* founded in the *true Nature and Reason of Things*.

THEY have undoubtedly their proper Uses. Though such *abstract* Reasonings being out of the Reach of *most*, are therefore of service to *few*; and being often mistaken, are therefore hurtful to *many*. And to tell you plainly my Thoughts, if Christians had confined themselves more to the Study of the divine Gospel of Christ, and run less into a Vein of *philosophizing* in Divinity, they had only followed a very glorious Example. For the great and learned Apostle declared to a learned and proud People, that he *determined not to know any Thing among them, save Jesus Christ and him crucified*. 1 Cor. ii. 2.

HOWEVER, with respect to the present Affair, surely nothing can be esteemed more absolutely

solutely agreeable to the *real Nature, Reason, and Essence of Things*, than to obey the Commands of *Him*, who is the great Author of *all Nature*, of *all Reason*, and of the *real Essence* of every Thing.

*Your sincere Friend,*

V. P.

HAVING thus, my Brethren, given you the Letter I mentioned at the Beginning; let us proceed now to such of Mr *Barclay's* Arguments, as have not yet been considered.

BUT first, that learned Gentleman lays down these three Propositions\*.

1. "*That there is but one Baptism*, as well as "*but one Lord, one Faith, &c.*" Ephes. iv. 4—6.

To what has been already observed upon this Objection, I shall here add, that if this learned Writer had reflected, that nothing is more usual both in the sacred Writings, and in all others, than *elliptical* Forms of Speech †, he could not, I think, have supposed this Expression an invincible Argument against *Water-Baptism*. Let us only read the Sentence thus, there is *one Lord, one Faith*, and *one* [outward] *Baptism*; and then all is safe and

\* *Apology, English*, Edit. 4. Proposition 12. Pag. 413, 414.

† Vid. *Lamberti Bos ellipses Græcas*.

and consistent. Mr *Barclay* would himself have owned, that something must be supplied in this very Sentence, with respect to the Word *Lord*. For if *God* the Father be *Lord*; then the Apostle can only be understood to say, there is but *one Lord* [*Jesus Christ*] otherwise *God* the Father will be excluded from being *Lord*.

WE pass on to his two other Propositions.

2. *That this one Baptism, which is the Baptism of Christ, is not a washing with, or dipping in Water, but a being baptized by the Spirit.*

3. *That the Baptism of John was but a Figure of this, and therefore, as the Figure, to give Place to the Substance; which though it be to continue, yet the other is ceased.*

THOUGH we have already considered some of this Gentleman's Arguments, in Support of his second Proposition; yet as he appears to lay no small Stress upon the three first *Proofs* taken together, I shall therefore not separate them.

*First Proof of the second Proposition.*

FIRST, "from the Testimony of *John*, the proper and peculiar Administrator of *Water Baptism*. St Matt. iii. 11. *I indeed baptize you with Water unto Repentance; but he that cometh after me, is mightier than I, whose Shoes I am not worthy to bear, he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire*".

*Proof*



*the People called* QUAKERS. 29

*Proof the Second:*

SECONDLY, "This, says Mr Barclay, is further confirmed by the Saying of Christ himself, *Acts* i. 4, 5. But wait for the Promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me: For John truly baptized with Water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many Days hence."

*Proof the Third:*

THIRDLY, "Peter observes the same Distinction, *Acts* xi. 16. Then remembered I the Word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with Water; but ye shall be baptized with the holy Ghost."

"FROM all which three Sentences, says Mr Barclay, relative one to another, First of John, Secondly of Christ, and Thirdly of Peter, it doth evidently follow, that such as were truly and really baptized with the Baptism of Water, were notwithstanding, not baptized with the Baptism of the Spirit, which is that of Christ; and such as truly and really did administer the Baptism of Water, did, in so doing, not administer the Baptism of Christ\*." To all which, I beg Leave to answer, That these three Passages do undoubtedly demonstrate, that the Baptism of St John, and the Descent of the Holy Spirit are very different Things; but they will not prove that our Lord

\* P. 415—417.

Lord did not himself institute a *Water-Baptism*; and therefore, we go on to that Gentleman's

*Fourth Proof:*

THIS he takes from the following Words of *St Peter, The like Figure whereunto, even Baptism, doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the Filth of the Flesh, but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God) by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.* 1 Epist. iii. 21.

“ So plain a Definition of *Baptism*, (Mr Barclay observes) is not in all the *Bible*; and therefore (says he) seeing it is so plain, it may well be preferred to all the coined Definitions of the Schoolmen †.”

BUT plain as I really think it is; I cannot help being of Opinion, that this learned Writer has mistaken the Sense of it; though his Translation of the Word *ἀντίτυπον* § be admitted. However, if this ingenious Author had reflected, that to be *saved*, in *Scripture-Language*, sometimes only signifies to be *put into a State*, which leads to *Salvation* ||; and that a *Negative* is sometimes only to be understood *comparatively* \*, he could not have drawn

† P. 419. § P. 420. It undoubtedly here signifies the Thing *figured*; though *Heb. ix. 24.* which is the other Place where it only occurs besides, in the *New Testament*, it means barely the *Figure* itself. Vid. *Grot. in loc.*

|| Ephes. ii. 5, 8. 2 Tim. i. 9. \* Gen. xlv. 8. Exod. xvi. 8. Jer. vii. 22. Luke xiv. 12. John vi. 27. See the learned *Glastius. Gram. 3, 5, 22, 487.*

drawn the Inferences from hence, which he has done.

THE Meaning of those Words of the Apostle, with the preceding ones, appear plainly to be this;  
 “ As *Noah* and his Family were preserved in the  
 “ *Ark*, in the midst of the *Deluge*; so *Baptism*,  
 “ which is hereby *figured*, puts all of us into a *save-*  
 “ *able* State: not *merely* the *outward* Washing,  
 “ but it must be accompanied by a proper Frame  
 “ and Disposition of Soul; such as *Repentance* and  
 “ *Faith*, in every *capable* Subject. And this  
 “ Right to everlasting Salvation, is ensured to us  
 “ *by the Resurrection of Christ; who was deliver-*  
 “ *ed for our Offences, and was raised again for*  
 “ *our Justification* \*.”

THIS Sense of the Words, which is perfectly agreeable to all Rules of *Interpretation*, and to the whole Tenor of *divine Revelation*, is entirely agreeable with *Water-Baptism*.

BUT again, Mr *Barclay* attempts to make good his *second Proposition*, from several Passages of *St Paul*; as where he tells the *Romans*, *That so many of them as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his Death; buried with him by Baptism into Death, that they should walk in Newness of Life.* To the *Galatians*, he thus speaks, *For as many of you, as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ:* and again, writing to the *Colossians*, the Apostle says, *That they were buried*

\* Rom. iv. 25.



*with him in Baptism, and risen with him through the Faith of the Operation of God* †.

HERE the learned Author remarks, That the Apostle speaks generally, without any *exclusive Term*, but *comprehensive* of all. From whence he concludes, “ That *St Paul* cannot here speak of “ *Water-Baptism*; but of the *Baptism* of the *Spirit*: because else it would follow, says Mr “ *Barclay*, that whosoever had been *baptized* with “ *Water-Baptism*, had *put on Christ*, and were “ *risen* with him; which all acknowledge to be most absurd §.”

IT is nothing new, to find learned and ingenious Men sometimes overlooking the *clearest* Things, when they set themselves to maintain any particular *Hypothesis*. Otherwise, the very Expressions here quoted by Mr *Barclay*, to wit, the being *buried with Christ in Baptism*, must naturally have led him to see, that the Apostle there alludes to the usual Practice of those Times, in *Baptizing*; which was the *plunging* or *dipping* of the Person into the Water. And as this Action did bear some Resemblance to the *Burying* of *Christ*; so did the *Rising* again out of the Water, bear some Resemblance to his *Resurrection*: And by both were signified the Duty and Engagement of the Person baptized, that he would *die to sin*, as *Christ died for it*;

† Rom. vi. 3, 4. Gal. iii. 27. Col. ii. 12.

§ P. 421, 422.

*it; and that he would rise to Newness of Life, in Imitation of his Lord's Resurrection from the Dead. But which could not be done, without such a living Faith, as God must work in them by his Holy Spirit; this being absolutely necessary to their putting on the Lord Jesus Christ. So that the Apostle most evidently appears to speak of Water-Baptism; and to declare what all engaged and promised to do; and what all were indispensably obliged to do, and labour after: and consequently Mr Barclay's second Proposition is not proved.*

HOWEVER, that Gentleman next proceeds to the Proof of his *third Proposition.*

THIRDLY, *Since John's Baptism was a Figure, and seeing the Figure gives way to the Substance, albeit the Thing figured remain, to wit, the one Baptism of Christ, yet the other ceaseth, which was the Baptism of John\*.*

As Mr Barclay here means that all *Water-Baptism* was to cease after *Christ*, and as most of his Arguments here used, are considered in the foregoing Letter; I must thither refer the Reader for Satisfaction. But what is not there spoke to, I shall here take some notice of.

BUT first, we are to observe, that Mr Barclay says, that “ *Paul labours to wean the Gentiles from the former Jewish Ceremonies and Observations,* though in so doing he was sometimes undeservedly judged by others of his Brethren, who

G

“ were

\* P. 423.

“ were unwilling to lay aside those *Ceremonies*.” Again, “ His Commission — did not require of him, that he should lead those Converts into such *Jewish Observations* and *Baptisms*, however that Practice was indulged in, and practised by the *other Apostles*, among their *Jewish Profelytes* : For which Cause, *he thanks God that he had baptized so few.*” \* 1 Cor. i. 14.

IT is allowed, that the *Jewish* Converts were indulged in *some* Things, for a Time; but where do we read that *St Paul* was *undeservedly* judged by *his Brethren*, for weaning the *Gentile Converts* from *Jewish Ceremonies*?

THAT he was often *undeservedly* judged by *false Brethren*, is very evident; † and if this was all that Mr *Barclay* designed, it is Pity he did not express himself more plainly: Though if he meant it of the former, he was certainly mistaken. Nor can I think that he has assigned the proper Reason, why St *Paul* is thankful that *he baptized so few*: Because the Apostle does himself assign a *different* Reason for it; and that is, — *lest any should say, that he had baptized in his own Name* ‡.

AGAIN, Mr *Barclay* observes upon those Words in the Commission given by *Christ*, to  
*baptize*

\* P. 428. † 2 Cor. x. 10—12. Chap. xi. 12—15. Gal. ii. 3—5. Chap. v. 10—12. Chap. vi. 12, 13, 17. ‡ 1 Cor. i. 15.



*baptize in the Name of the Father, Son, and Spirit; that the Greek is εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, that is, into the Name \*.*

THE Original is undoubtedly as that Gentleman observes: but he had too much Learning not to know, that notwithstanding the Greek Particle *εἰς* often signifies *into*; yet in many Places of the New Testament, † as well as in other Writers, it barely signifies *in*. Nay, in that very Evangelist, who mentions that Commission, the Phrase *εἰς ὄνομα* occurs three times in the Compass of two Verses; where I am certain Mr *Barclay* himself would not have scrupled to have render'd it as we have done; and that is, — *in the Name* ||.

HOWEVER, admitting Mr *Barclay's* Criticism, both as to the *Preposition* and the *Noun* following; and let the Sentence be translated — *into the Name, Virtue and Power*; yet even This will not destroy the Doctrine of *Water-Baptism*. — For surely, my dear Brethren, the Use of *Water* can never defeat or prevent the *Efficacy, Virtue, or Power* of the *holy Spirit*! And therefore, unless these Things can be proved so *absolutely inconsistent* with each other, that it is *utterly impossible*

C 2

for

\* P. 433. St Matth. xxviii. 19. † St Matth. ii. 23. Chap. x. 41, 42. St Mark xiii. 16. St Luke xi. 7. St John i. 18. || St Matth. x. 41, 42. And further it may be here observed, that St *Luke* varies the Phrase, where he speaks of the Baptism of *Cornelius*; and instead of *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, he expresses it *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*, Acts x. 48.

for them to subsist together, or in *one* and the *same* Subject: I say, unless This can be demonstrated, a Person may undoubtedly be baptized with *Water-Baptism*; and yet, at the same Time, be baptized into the *Name, Virtue, and Power* of the *Father, Son, and holy Ghost*. — So that supposing there is a Mistake in the *Form* of administering *Baptism*; yet even this will not prove, that *Water-Baptism* is *not* to be administer'd.

HOWEVER, we shall take Notice of two other Objections of this learned Writer, against understanding Those Words as a *Form prescribed by Christ*. — Because, “ *then surely, says he, his Apostles would have made use of that Form in the administering of Water-Baptism, to such as they baptized with Water: But though particular mention be made in divers Places of the Acts, who were baptized, and how; and though it be particularly expressed, that they baptized such and such; yet there is not a Word of this Form \*.*”

“ And in two Places, it is said of some, that they were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus; † by which it yet more appears, that either the Author of this *History* hath been very defective, who having so often occasion to mention this, yet omitteth so substantial a Part of

\* Acts ii. 41. Chap. viii. 12, 13, 38. Chap. ix. 18. Chap. x 48. Chap. xvi. 15. Chap. xviii. 8. † Chap. viii. 16. Chap. xix. 5.

“ of *Baptism*, (which were to accuse the *Holy*  
 “ *Ghost*, by whose Guidance *Luke* wrote it) or  
 “ else, that the Apostles did no ways understand,  
 “ that *Christ*, by his Commission, *Matth.* xxviii.  
 “ did enjoin them such a Form of *Water-Bap-*  
 “ *tism*, seeing they did not use it \*.”

BUT now, with Submission to this Gentleman’s Reasoning, the Apostles might use *This Form*, notwithstanding all that is here objected.

YOU know, as well as I can tell you, that very many Things are *not recorded*, which however were *transacted* † ; and consequently, it is no Proof that *This Form* was *not* used; because it is not *mentioned*. It is but a *fair* and *reasonable* Presumption, that Things were done by the Apostles, *according* to the *Command* of *Christ*; where we are not informed of the *contrary*.

INDEED the two other Instances, of Persons being *baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus* ‖, have the *Appearance* of a stronger Argument against *such a Form*, than any Omissions whatever. But if we understand those Passages, as I presume they should be understood, to wit, that such Persons were *baptized* into the *Faith*, and *Doctrine*, and *Obedience* of *Christ*; there will then be no Inconsistency between *That Form* and the *Practice* of the *Apostles*. There are other Ways

C 3

of

\* P. 434.

† St John xx. 30. Chap. xxi. 25.

‖ Acts viii. 16. Chap. xix. 5. See also Chap. ii. 38. and Chap. x. 48.



of reconciling these Things, which the Learned may consider at their Leisure \*.

AT P. 437, and 439, Mr *Barclay* is guilty of two great Mistakes, which are taken Notice of in the preceding Letter. For speaking of St *Peter's* going to *Cornelius*, he says, that *he was for a Season judged for it, by the rest of his Brethren.*

AND further, that it was the most general Sense of the *Church*, that *the Gentiles should be circumcised.* — If by *Brethren*, that Gentleman meant *his Brother-Apostles*; and by *Church*, the *Assembly of Those Apostles*, then have we already proved, that neither of these was so.

AN Over-eagerness to maintain what is not defensible, will expose the best and wisest of Men to many Overights.

BUT again, Mr *Barclay* supposes those Words of our holy Lord to *Nicodemus*, — *Except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit* — not to relate to *Water-Baptism* †. But herein, though he has *some* Moderns of his Side, yet *all Antiquity* is against him ||.

HOWEVER, setting aside all *human Authority*,  
whether

\* Non excludit Patrem & Spiritum sanctum, quia illos Judæi agnoverunt, sed Christum duntaxat nominat, quippe quem nondum agnoverant. — *Lightfoot* in *Act.* ch. ii. 38. — Ex nomine *Christi* tacite intelligitur & qui unxit, Pater, & Spiritus, quo unctus est. — *Grotius* in *Act.* Ch. x. 48.

† P. 440, &c. St John iii. 5.

|| See the Learned and Judicious *Hooker*, L. v. S. 59.

whether *ancient* or *modern*; let it be considered, that our Lord is there talking with a *Master of Israel*, who was well acquainted with the Manner of initiating *Profelytes* amongst the *Jews*; and therefore our blessed Saviour mentions one of their *Rites*, which He designed should be adopted to his own Use; that is, that such as would become *Profelytes* to *his* Religion, should be *initiated* likewise by *Water*, as a *Symbol* of *Purification*; but that this outward Washing must be attended by the *inward Operation* of the Holy Spirit. This, I presume, is the plain and natural Meaning of those Words.

AND now, if the Whole which has been said, be attended to with a serious and unprejudiced Mind, I should hope, my Brethren, that *Water-Baptism* would evidently appear to you, to be an Ordinance or Institution of *Christ* himself.

As to Mr *Barclay's* affirming, that *the Baptism of Infants is a meer human Tradition, for which neither Precept nor Practice is to be found in all the Scriptures* \*; though it would be no difficult Matter to shew *Infant-Baptism* had a much better Foundation than this Gentleman here allows it; yet as This is not the Subject we are now upon, we shall therefore dismiss it, at least for the present; and proceed to Mr *Barclay's* Arguments in relation to the *Lord's Supper*.

C 4

BUT

\* P. 409.

BUT first; After this ingenious Writer has treated largely on the *spiritual* feeding on *Christ*, he proceeds to observe the Feuds and Animosities, as well as the various Explanations, which have arose concerning *this Subject* \*: whereas, if a thousand more Disputes had arisen, they would be no manner of Proof, that *Bread* and *Wine* were not to be used in celebrating the *Lord's Supper*; or that *this Supper* was not a *standing Ordinance*.

INDEED when Men, whether *Papists*, *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, or of any other Denomination, will indulge their Fancies in *Metaphysical* Subtleties, is it any wonder, that they should neither understand themselves, nor one another? This learned Author wanted not to be told, that though the Disputes of Men might too often *darken* the Truths of Religion; yet those Truths were always the *same*.

AGAIN, supposing that the *only End* of this *Ordinance*, was to *remember Christ* §; or to be a *Memorial of his Death* †; would it therefore follow, that *Bread* and *Wine* were not to be used in the Celebration of it? or that it was not an Ordinance of perpetual Obligation?

BUT then, though Mr *Barclay* owns that *Bread* and *Wine* were made use of, both by our holy Lord,

\* P. 453—456. See also P. 484, 485. § P. 459.

† P. 461, 463.



Lord, and by the *Corinthians*, † yet he denies it to be a *standing Ordinance in the Church of Christ, obligatory upon all* ||.

IN order to prove this Point, he repeats \* what he had observed before, † that “ this Ceremony  
“ is only mentioned by three of the Evangelists,  
“ and the Apostle to the *Corinthians*.

“ That *Matthew* and *Mark* only give an Account of the Matter of Fact, to which *Luke*  
“ adds these Words, — *This do in Remembrance of*  
“ *me* ||.”

IT is true, that none of the *Evangelists* mention this Precept, but St *Luke* only. But if any should conclude from hence, that Mr *Barclay* supposed those Words did therefore want some further Authority, such Person would certainly wrong that Gentleman exceedingly. For speaking elsewhere of St *Luke*, Mr *Barclay* affirms, as we have before observed, that *he wrote by the Guidance of the holy Ghost* †.

AND surely one single Testimony of the holy Ghost is as infallibly true, as ten thousand. Tho’ we have also the concurrent Authority of St *Paul*, who mentions to the *Corinthians*, those very Words recorded by the *Evangelist*; and which the Apostle declares he *had received from the Lord* \*\*.

So that this Precept, — *Do this in Remembrance of me*, — seems surely to be something more, than

a

† P. 464.

|| P. 466.

|| P. 465.

† P. 434.

\* Ibid.

† P. 459.

\*\* 1 Cor. xi. 23, 24.

42. *An affectionate ADDRESS to*

a mere *temporary* Precept, which only related to some particular Times or Seasons. Since it was not only given by our holy Lord at his *last Supper*; but it was many Years after a Part of *that Gospel*, which He himself *taught* the great Apostle\*, and which, under the *Guidance* and *Influence* of the *holy Spirit* †, the Apostle instructs the *Corinthians* in; that they might, for the future, *eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup*, in a *worthy* and *becoming* Manner; and avoid that Punishment which befel many, for their negligent and wicked Behaviour §.

SUCH *Directions* and *Cautions*, given by St Paul to those People upon this Occasion, in so solemn a Manner, seem as evidently to be recorded for the Use and Service of the Church in all Ages, as any other *Directions* or *Cautions* in the whole Gospel. And therefore I beg of you to reflect, whether this Precept ought to be esteemed only as our Lord's Command to his Apostles, about *washing each others Feet*; and as the ancient Ceremony of using Oil in *anointing the Sick* ||: Or whether it has not all the plain Marks of a *binding* Ordinance to all Christians whatever.

MR Barclay indeed supposes each of these with the Command *to abstain from Things strangled, and from Blood*, to be only of a *temporary* Nature \*\*;

\* Gal. i. 11, 12.

§ Chap. xi. 20—34.

xiii. 1—15. James v. 14.

† 1 Cor. vii. 40. Chap. xiv. 37.

|| P. 467—470, 479, 480. John

\*\* P. 479. Acts xv. 29.

and consequently of no *lasting* Obligation ; but whatever may be concluded of the rest, (though the Learned are not all agreed about them) I must beg Leave to be of Opinion, that the *Lord's Supper* stands upon a Foundation, not to be moved by such kind of Arguments. For either those *other* Precepts are *still* of *Force*, or they are *not*. If they *are* of *Force* ; then Christians are highly blameable for neglecting of them : But even tho' their *Force* or *Obligation* should' now be ceased ; how does it follow from hence, that *we are under no Obligation to celebrate the Lord's Supper, according to his first Institution* ?

AGAIN, supposing it *wrong* for Christians to celebrate this *Ordinance* in the *Morning*, and *only by itself* †. Granting, what is but too melancholy a Truth, that there have been *great Contests* betwixt the *Greek and Latin Churches* ; and likewise between the *Lutherans and Calvinists*, about the *kind* of Bread ; whether it should be *leavened* or *unleavened* § ? Granting, that there have arose many Doubts and Disputes about the *Nature, Efficacy*, and *Manner* of celebrating this *Ordinance* ; and whether it was to be given to the *Sick and Dying*, or not || ? Nay, admitting that the whole *Protestant* World had talked absurdly about *Types* and *Anti-types*, or one *Shadow* or *Figure* pointing to another \*. — I say, supposing even a thousand more Objections of the like kind ; can you, my Brethren,

† P. 470.

§ P. 471.

|| P. 472, 473.

\* P. 482.



thren; really think that it follows from hence, that *Christians are therefore not obliged to celebrate the Lord's Supper, with Bread and Wine?*

MEN may, by their *Follies* and *Vices*, by their *Mistakes* and *Ignorance*, talk very weakly of divine Truths; may even *pervert* the Commands of Christ, and render them of no *Effect*, with regard to themselves; but neither the *Weakness* nor the *Wickedness* of Men, can *disannul* any of those Commands; nor *cancel* our Obligation to comply with them.

WHEN the Church of *Corinth* had been guilty of gross Irregularities, with respect to this *Institution* of *Christ*, the holy Apostle reminds them Who was the Author of it; and after what *Manner* it was instituted by Him: what was the *End* and *Design* of it; and *how* they themselves were to behave, if they desired to eat the *Lord's Supper*, as they ought to do.

HE is so far from intimating, that “*They were apt to use that Practice in a superstitious Mind,*” or *beyond the true Use of it*; so as to make of “*it some mystical Supper of the Lord:*” I say, the Apostle is so far from intimating this, as Mr *Barclay* is pleased to remark †; that I readily submit it to the unprejudiced Judgment of all of you, whether the *Reverse* of this be not the Case? They are reprov'd for greedily *seizing their own Supper*; and thus *despising the Church of God*; and

† P. 476.

and for *contemptuously treating their poor Brethren*; by leaving them to be *Hungry*, but being *Drunk* themselves. And therefore, where is the Wonder if the Apostle tells them, that *this is not to eat the Lord's Supper* §.

BUT is there any thing in this Charge, my Brethren, that looks like *Superstition*; like going *beyond the true Use* of this Ordinance; or *making of it some mystical Supper of the Lord*? Their Behaviour was so far from being *Superstitious*, that it was plainly void of *common Decency*. They were so far from *exceeding* in their Devotion, that they were quite *profane*: and so far from esteeming this Ordinance, as *some mystical Supper of the Lord*; that they did only *eat and drink to their own Condemnation, not discerning the Lord's Body*. For *this Cause*, says the Apostle, *many are Weak and Sickly among you, and many Sleep* †.

THEIR immoral Behaviour brought down immediate Judgments from Heaven; some were punished with *Sickness*, some with *Death*.

To prevent which for the future, by removing the fatal Occasion of them, the Apostle gives the *Corinthians* a short History of this *holy Institution*, in the Words of *Christ* himself, in relation to both Parts of it; — *Take, eat, this is my Body which is broken for you: this do in Remembrance of me.*

— *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*

*This*

*This do ye, as oft as ye Drink it, in Remembrance of me. For as often, says the Apostle, as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this Bread, and drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.*

AND after St Paul had thus set before them the very Words of *Christ* himself; and had acquainted them, what *that Ordinance* was to remind them of; as well as the great Danger of *unworthily* Partaking of it; he next proceeds to give the following Directions for their future Conduct, in approaching the *Lord's Supper*; *But let a Man examine himself, and so let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup* \*.

Now I must beseech you, my Brethren, impartially to consider, whether all this seems to amount to no more, than if the Apostle was giving Orders about some mere *temporary Ceremony*; which the *Corinthians* were to be indulged in for a Time; but which was to be laid aside, when they grew up to a more mature State in Christianity †? Or whether here is not all the plain Marks of a *standing Ordinance* in the Church of *Christ*, which was to oblige every Christian to a constant and devout Compliance, let his Proficiency be more or less? You know, that notwithstanding the Indulgence used toward the *Jews*, by

this

\* Ver. 23—28.

† P. 478.



this Apostle\*, yet how strenuously he set himself to oppose their most darling *Rite of Circumcision*, when they began to mistake and pervert it†. And can we suppose, that this faithful and inspired Servant of *Christ*, or in other Words, that the Holy Spirit, would have omitted putting the *Corinthians* in mind, (if it had been so) that this whole Affair of the *Lord's Supper* was only mere Matter of *Indulgence* to them; and therefore since they abused it in such a Manner, as to bring down Judgments upon their Heads, it was high time to lay it aside?

BUT can you, my Brethren, find the least Hint or Intimation of this sort? So far from it, that the Apostle by directing them *to examine themselves*, and *so to eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup; to tarry one for another, when they came together to eat*; and that *if any Man hunger, he should eat at home*; that so they might *not come together unto Condemnation* ||; I say, the Apostle by giving these Directions, appears most evidently to instruct them, that it was not only their Duty to celebrate this Ordinance with all possible *Care, and Reverence, and Devotion*; but that they were to *persist and continue* in the Celebration of it.

HOWEVER, “ that this whole Matter was a  
 “ mere Act of Indulgence and Condescension of  
 “ the Apostle, to the weak and carnal *Corin-*  
 “ *thians.*”

\* Acts xvi. 3. Chap. xxi. 18—26. 1 Cor. ix. 19, 20.

† Gal. ii. 3—5. Chap. v. 2, 3. || 1 Cor. xi. 28, 33, 34.

“ *thians,*” Mr Barclay says, “ appears yet more  
 “ by the Syriac Copy, which (*ver. 17.*) in [*St*  
 “ *Paul’s*] entering upon this Matter, hath it thus  
 “ — *In that, concerning which I am about to com-*  
 “ *mand you (or instruct you) I commend you not,*  
 “ because ye have not gone forward, but are de-  
 “ scended unto that which is less, (or of *less Con-*  
 “ *sequence*) clearly importing (says Mr Barclay)  
 “ that the Apostle was grieved, that such was  
 “ their Condition, that he was forced to give  
 “ them Instructions concerning those outward  
 “ Things; and doting upon which, they shew  
 “ they were not gone forward in the *Life of*  
 “ *Christianity*, but rather sticking in *beggarly Ele-*  
 “ *ments*. And therefore (*ver. 20.*) the same *Ver-*  
 “ *sion* hath it thus; — *When then ye meet toge-*  
 “ *ther, ye do not do it, as it is just ye should do*  
 “ *in the Day of the Lord, ye eat and drink it:*  
 “ therefore shewing to them, (Mr Barclay ob-  
 “ serves) that to meet together to eat and drink  
 “ *outward Bread and Wine*, was not the Labour  
 “ and Work of that *Day of the Lord*\*.”

I WAS willing to give this whole Paragraph  
 entire, because some may possibly lay great Stress  
 upon it: and I must further add, that this learned  
 Writer takes notice, that with respect to the  
 17th Verse, the *Arabic* and *Ethiopic* Versions agree  
 with the *Syriac*.

BUT

\* P. 478, 479.

BUT now I must first observe, that if Mr Bar-  
clay could have produced one antient Greek Ma-  
nuscript, which had *this Reading*, it would have  
been of much greater Authority, than all these  
*Versions*. That learned Gentleman knew this very  
well; but what was not to be had, he could not  
produce. And it is a very great Objection against  
the *Reading* in those two Verses, that no antient  
Greek Copy supports it.

BUT still further; let us examine of what Au-  
thority these *oriental Versions* may be upon this  
Occasion. A late very learned Writer, who had  
taken no small Pains about these Things, and who  
was disposed to speak as favourably of the *Syriac*  
*Version*, as in Justice he could, yet owns, tha  
“ we cannot always learn from it, what was in  
“ the Original Greek; that in some Places it only  
“ gives us a *Commentary*, instead of a *Translation*;  
“ that in others, it omits not only such Parts of  
“ the Greek Text, as are of small Consequence;  
“ but also Words of great moment; that some-  
“ times it *inserts, adds, and changes* several [ Words  
“ or Things ] and sometimes renders the Greek  
“ altogether wrong, and contrary to the Sense of  
“ the Place\*.” So that notwithstanding it should  
be *the best, without any Exception, of all the Tran-*  
*slations made by the Antients*, as another learned  
Person affirms†; yet we see that this *Syriac Ver-*  
D *sion,*

\* D. Millii Prolegom. in Nov. Test. P. 128. † Dean  
Prideaux's Connection, V. 2. Part 2. B. 1. P. 48. Edit. 8.



*sion*, where it is thus unsupported by the Original *Greek*, can be but of very little Authority. As to the *Arabic* Version, the former learned Writer thinks it “*now and then* more correct, and more “ agreeing with the Generality of *Greek* Copies, “ than even the *Syriac* \* :” Though a learned “ Foreigner says, “ It is easy to discern, that “ *this Version* is by no means pure †.”

LET us next enquire, whether we can find a better Character of the *Ethiopic Version*.

THE last mentioned Critic says, — “ It is so “ *inaccurate*, that it is altogether unworthy of “ any further Consideration ‡.”

AND though the first of these learned Men pronounce it “ for the most Part sufficiently accurate in the Gospels; yet in the *Acts*, he “ says, several Things are here and there *omitted*; “ others are translated *wrong*, and *contrary* to “ the Sense of the *Greek* Text.” And in the Epistles of St *Paul*, (Matters are far from being mended; for he affirms that in these) “ a “ still greater Liberty appears, and sometimes a “ *prodigious Wandring* from the Letter of the “ Text. The Translator (says he) was so far “ from observing the Number of Words which “ were before his Eyes, that in some Places he “ did

\* Dr *Whitby's Examen. variant. Lect. D. Millii. L. 1. c. 4. Sect. 4*

† *Simonii Crit. Hist. c. 18. p. 158.*

‡ *Idem, ibid. c. 17. p. 145.*

“ did not at all *attend* to their *Meaning*, or *Sig-*  
“ *nification* ||.”

Now judge, my Brethren, whether *such Trans-*  
*lations* are fit to set aside the Authority of the  
*Original Text*!

BUT still, to render it evident to any Reader  
of plain Understanding, that the *Syriac Version*  
cannot there be depended on, let us examine how  
those two Verses in that *Version* agree with the  
Context.

AND first then; pray compare the 17th Verse  
of that Translation, and also Mr *Barclay's* Ex-  
planation, with these Words in the following  
Verse; — “ *For first of all, when ye come toge-*  
“ *ther in the Church, I hear that there be Divi-*  
“ *sions among you.*”

BUT what, I beseech you, have these *Divisions*  
or *Schisms* to do with their *descending to what was*  
*of less Consequence*; that is, *outward Things*, or  
*beggarly Elements*? What Connection or Simili-  
tude have These with one another? Who can  
doubt, but here have been some *Insertions*, *Ad-*  
*ditions*, or *Alterations*?

AGAIN, let the 20th Verse of the same *Ver-*  
*sion*, and likewise Mr *Barclay's* Remarks upon it,  
be compared with the 21st Verse. But first let  
us consider the 20th Verse of the *Syriac Version*.

D 2

“ *When*

“ *When then ye meet together, ye do not do it  
 “ as it is just ye should do in the Day of the Lord;  
 “ ye eat and drink it.*”

Mr *Barclay* saw plainly that these Words abundantly wanted some *Exposition*; and therefore he thus explains them: “ To meet together to-eat and drink *outward Bread and Wine*, was not the Labour and Work of that *Day of the Lord.*”

BUT now, supposing this the *Meaning* of the *Syriac Interpreter*; the Difficulty will be to make it the *Meaning* of the *Apostle*; and unless this can be done, the Sense of the *Syriac Version* will be to little Purpose. Therefore let us next attend to the following Words of the *Apostle*; *ver. 21.*  
 “ *For in eating, every one taketh before other, his  
 “ own Supper: and one is hungry, and another is  
 “ drunken.*”

Now I entreat you, impartially and attentively to consider, whether these Words, and those of the *Syriac Interpreter*, have any thing to do with one another? and yet this Verse most evidently relates to the foregoing. Mr *Barclay* supposes the Sense of the *Syriac Version* to be, as if the *Apostle* had reproved the *Corinthians*, for *meeting together to eat and drink outward Bread and Wine*; as not being *the Labour and Work of that Day of the Lord*. But does the following Verse so much as give the most distant Hint, that this was the Design of St *Paul*? Does he not there expressly tell them,



them, that the Reason of his Reproof was a very different Thing? to wit, *Because in eating each took his Supper before another*; which caused one to remain *hungry*, and another to be *drunken*? — This he had just before told them, in the preceeding Verse, was *not to eat the Lord's Supper*. It was a gross Abuse and Profanation of it.

So that according to the *Reading* of the *Original Greek*, all is *clear*, and *plain*, and *consistent*. Whereas, if we take the *Syriac Version*, there is no manner of *Coherence* or *Consistency* in the Apostle's Words. And therefore we have abundant Reason to think, that the learned Critic was right, whom we first mentioned, when he affirms, that the *Syriac Interpreter sometimes rendered the Greek altogether wrong, and contrary to the Sense of the Place*.

HOWEVER, if Mr *Barclay* laid more Stress upon *these Versions*, than should have been laid upon them, I would be far from insinuating, that it was either owing to want of great Abilities or great Integrity. The best and wisest of Men, are liable to Mistakes, and especially in defending any favourite Points. How far he was mistaken both with regard to *Water-Baptism*, and the *Supper of the Lord*, I have endeavoured to explain; and beg you will consider what is here offered, with a *single Eye* to the Honour of God, and your own eternal Happiness.

BUT

BUT now, I would not be misunderstood; I would not be supposed to say, that we are to look no further, than merely to the *outward Elements* in the *Lord's Supper*. They have a *spiritual Meaning* and *Design*; and if with a *true penitent Heart* and *lively Faith*, we there *discern the Lord's Body*; I doubt not, but the *outward Bread and Wine* will be accompanied with the *spiritual Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ*.

TRUE, most undoubtedly it is, that God is not confined to the Use of *external Means*, either *here* or in *Baptism*; but then, my Brethren, let it be well considered, that if He has prescribed *those Means* to us, it must be great Presumption to put *asunder, what He has joined together*.

MAY the *Lord Jesus* give you, and me, and every one, a right *Understanding in all Things*.

*Your sincere Well-wisher,*

15 JY 64

V. P.

*Published by the same* AUTHOR.

I. **A** *Vindication of Mr Locke, from the Charge of giving Encouragement to Scepticism and Infidelity, and from several other Mistakes and Objections of the learned Author of the Procedure, Extent, and Limits of human Understanding. In six Dialogues. Wherein is likewise enquired, whether Mr Locke's true Opinion of the Soul's Immateriality, was not mistaken by the late learned Mr Leibnitz.*

*Humani nihil à me alienum puto.* TER.

II. A Second *Vindication of Mr Locke*, wherein his Sentiments relating to *Personal Identity*, are cleared up from some Mistakes of the Reverend Dr Butler (now Lord Bishop of Bristol) in his Dissertation on that Subject, and the various Objections raised against Mr Locke, by the learned Author of *An Enquiry into the Nature of the human Soul*, are considered; to which are added *Reflections* on some Passages of Dr Watts's Philosophical Essays.

*Censure is the Tax a Man pays to the Publick for being Eminent.* Lord BACON.

III. Some *Enquiries*, chiefly relating to *spiritual Beings*: in which the Opinions of Mr Hobbes, with regard to *Sensation, Immaterial Substance*, and the *Attributes* of the Deity, are taken Notice of. And wherein likewise is examined, how far the Supposition of an *invisible Tempter*, is defensible on the Principles of natural Reason. In four Dialogues.

Τὸν Θεὸν, ὅντα τὸ σοφώτατον, βελομενόντ' ἐπιμελειᾶσαι καὶ δυνάμενον. Plut. de Leg. L. 10.

Ψυχὴν αὖ ἔιν, πρὸς τῷ ἀθάνατῳ εἶναι, καὶ ἀνώλεθρον. Idem in Phædone.

Δαίμων κακὸς τρέπων πρὸς ἀδικίαν. Zaleuc. apud Stobæum.

IV. Some Thoughts on the divine *Hospitality* of the Gospel; and on *Hospitality* falsely so called; in a Discourse on Rom. xii. 13.

V. An



*Published by the same Author.*

V. An Essay on *Recreations.*

*Neque enim ita generati à Naturâ sumus, ut ad ludum et jocum facti esse videamur: sed ad severitatem potius et aliquam studia graviora, atque majora.* Cic. de Officiis, L. i. c. 29.

VI. An earnest Exhortation to the strict Practice of *Christianity.* Drawn up chiefly for the Use of the Inhabitants of the Parish of *Shoreham in Kent.*

*Strait is the Gate, and narrow is the Way which leadeth unto Life, and few there be that find it.* St Matth. vii. 14.

*If any Man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his Cross daily, and follow me.* St Luke ix. 23.

VII. Some Reflections, by way of Dialogue, on the Nature of *Original Sin, Baptismal Regeneration, Repentance, the New Birth, Faith, Justification, Christian Perfection, or Universal Holiness, and the Inspiration of the Spirit of God.*

Ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν χριστὸν ἰσαυρωμένον, ἰσδακτοῖς μὲν σκάνδαλον, Ἕλλησι δὲ μωρίαν. 1 Cor. i. 23.

— σὺ τί λέγεις, ὦ Ἕλλην; σοφίαν ζητεῖς; ἔχεις τὸν χριστὸν, σοφίαν ὅντα τῷ Πατρὶ. Ὅτι μὲν γὰρ φιλόσοφοι περιψυχρά κ' ἀνόνητα ηὐχολήθησαν· ὁ δὲ γαυρὸς τὸν κόσμον ἴσως.

Theophyl. in 1 Cor. i. 24, 25.

Νέκρωσον τοίνυν τὸ σῶμα, ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ἦ σοι, κ' οὐ αἰτλὸ δοθῇ σοι ἡ ζωή. Idem in Rom. viii. 11.

Humbly inscribed to the Most Reverend and Right Reverend the Lords the Archbishops and Bishops of *England.*

dum  
uqua  
c. 29.

Cbrif  
s. of the

leadetb  
iii. 14.

lf, and  
3.

ne Na  
ce, the  
or Uni  
od.

and

dy Xei  
oi ne  
owoi.

5.  
ay di

Reve  
nd.